

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/112760>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

“An Office in Which She Had Always Depended”:

Surrogate Managers in Jane Austen’s *Mansfield Park* and *Persuasion*

Abstract: This article analyses the ways in which Jane Austen explores questions concerning female property management in two of her novels, *Mansfield Park* and *Persuasion*. These two novels are particularly relevant, as they share one common aspect: in both, two female characters attempt to appropriate the position of manager of a house they have no possibility of ever owning, thus replacing the legitimate manager. By analysing these two novels, I aim to show how Austen engages with the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century discourse on female management and considers the possibilities and limits of this form of relationship with houses.

Keywords: surrogate managers, management, *Mansfield Park*, *Persuasion*, Jane Austen, women and houses, oeconomy

In *Romantics, Rebels and Reactionaries* (1981), Marilyn Butler famously presented Jane Austen as a conservative who expressed in her novels the ideas she acquired from conduct books: “Her reading, in sermons and conduct-books, must have given her old-fashioned notions of social cohesion and obligation, such as were still invoked, when it suited them, by conservative propagandists like Burke.”¹ This argument has been contested by authors such as Claudia Johnson who, in *Jane Austen: Women, Politics and the Novel*, states that it denies Austen an “active participation in the war of ideas.”² Johnson also emphasises the various ways in which Austen’s work parodies conduct books and distances itself from the values advocated in them. We know Austen was well-informed about such publications, since authors such as More, West, Edgeworth and Gisborne are mentioned at several points in her letters. However, in contrast to these two points of view, this article will aim to present Austen as an author whose work is neither aimed at fulfilling a didactic function nor characterised by moral anarchy. Indeed, the set of values comprised in oeconomy, such as frugality, utility, social responsibility and ability for self-management are presented as laudable in the novels. Whenever a woman is portrayed as a good household manager in Austen she usually possesses all of these qualities or acquires them throughout the novel. Nevertheless, Austen’s engagement with questions surrounding female management is more complex than the direct prescription of certain values.

This complexity is, to some extent, explained by Nora Nachumi: “As Margaret Kirkham contends, Austen was an enlightenment feminist, someone who firmly believed in women’s ability to reason. Her primary interest is in establishing women’s agency, both as spectators and as readers.”³

Writing specifically about *Mansfield Park*, Nachumi argues that this novel “encourages its readers — regardless of their gender — to experience both a rational and an emotional response to the plays they watch, the novels they read, and the fictions they encounter in their daily lives.”⁴ As far as questions on female management are concerned, Austen expects the same kind of rational engagement from her readers that Nachumi mentions. Despite Austen’s disagreement with a considerable part of the ideas defended in conduct books and her rejection of their didacticism, her novels are patently influenced by this dialogue on female management. Austen was, therefore, not “given . . . old-fashioned notions,” as Butler argues, but motivated by the plethora of works on management to consider this topic and explore it in her novels. As will be demonstrated, rather than employ her novels as fictional conduct books through which to convey straightforward moral lessons, Austen uses them as a means through which to problematise questions regarding management. In doing so, she expects her readers to engage critically with her work and the topics it covers in the same way that she does with conduct books.

1. Management, conduct and morality

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were characterised by the popularity of conduct books directed at men. Instructing men on questions as diverse as property management, investments and social conduct, this type of literature became extremely prolific. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, an entire genre of conduct books directed specifically at women had become established. Authors such as Mary Wollstonecraft, Hannah More, Maria Edgeworth and Mrs Bonhote, to name a few, wrote on female conduct and the ways in which improvements in their education would allow them to become better people, wives, mothers and household managers. In *Sensibility and Economics in the Novel*, Gillian Skinner calls attention to an important pattern which characterised the conduct book literature on management: “‘economy’ was something regularly recommended in such books, whether they were addressed to women or men. For women, however, effective management was strictly confined to the household.”⁵ And, indeed, conduct books such as *Domestic Management and the Art of Conducting a Family* states that: “It being the department of the master of the family to provide for it, it devolves to the mistress to make the provision allowed go as far as it can.”⁶ Management, therefore, is represented as one of the few possible axes to property for women, whereas for men it is one of the many. Unsurprisingly, the level of responsibility derived from management is not underestimated in conduct books. This is illustrated by Mrs Taylor’s *Practical Hints to Young Females, on the Duties of a Wife, a Mother, and a Mistress of a Family*, where she

argues that a man's prosperity depends not only on his own agency but also the woman's responsible management:

There are few husbands so adroit in the management of their incomes as to be entirely able to defend them from dissipation, where ignorance and extravagance are the characteristics of the wife. Vain are his labours to accumulate, if she cannot, or will not, expend with discretion. Vain too are his expectations of happiness, if economy, order, and regularity are not to be found at home: and the woman who has not feeling and principle sufficient to regulate her conduct in these concerns, will rarely acquit herself respectably in the more elevated parts of female duty.⁷

This text thus presents the role of the female household manager as one that is complementary to that of the male manager. As Karen Harvey explains, although the prevalent system in this period was a patriarchal one, it “[accommodated] the exercise of often considerable authority on the part of women in the interests of the shared household unit. Women’s agency in the household was entirely compatible with the central tenet of the discourse of oeconomy that men had ultimate control over goods and property” (78). The master of the house ultimately held legal control over the property, but it does not follow that a woman was constrained to a limitative and submissive role in the household. As indicated by the excerpt in Mrs Taylor’s conduct book, the role of female manager would encompass the exercise of financial rectitude, which was dependent on her ability for self-restraint. This last aspect, according to Nancy Armstrong, meant that a woman “had to lack the competitive desires and worldly ambitions that consequently belonged — as if by some natural principle — to the male.”⁸ Consequently, the female manager’s responsible and morally sound conduct, combined with her ability to put her own personal interests and desires aside, was essential for the financial prosperity of the family.

By bestowing importance on a woman’s ability to self-regulate, which would subsequently allow her to regulate those around her and manage the household successfully, conduct book authors established a link between good household management and a woman’s self-management. In doing so, these authors also placed themselves strongly in opposition to ideas on female education which encouraged the display of women’s bodies, “a carry-over from the Renaissance display of aristocratic power,” and recommended “a whole new set of economic practices that directly countered what were supposed to be seen as the excesses of a decadent aristocracy.”⁹ This is consistent with contemporary ideas of the middle class as a “bastion of moderation and temperance,” “not vitiated by luxury on the one hand, and not depressed by poverty on the other,” as stated by Dror Wahrman.¹⁰ According to these works, the objectification resulting from that

previous model of female excellence robbed women of subjectivity and the ability to step outside of themselves, of which the successful management of the household and supervision of those dependent on them depended. As Armstrong phrases it, such a woman could not be “‘seen’ and still be vigilant.”¹¹

This objectification of women was an aspect of the current system of female education severely criticised by virtually every single conduct book author, regardless of political affiliation, from Mary Wollstonecraft to arguably more conservative authors such as Hannah More. As Talia Shaffer argues, by the middle of the nineteenth century, domestic activities such as handicrafts stopped being associated with “aristocratic leisure” and instead “signified the moral, managerial virtues of the bourgeoisie” as well as what was seen as a distinctly middle-class “thrifty, skilful mode of domestic management.”¹² As such, authors began to criticise the previous model of female excellence, regarding it as a threat to a woman’s responsible performance of her role as household manager. In *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, for example, Wollstonecraft criticises the way in which a system of female education too focused on accomplishments such as needlework contracts . . . [women’s] faculties more than any other that could have been chosen for them, by confining their thoughts to their persons.”¹³ In *The Parental Monitor*, Mrs Bonhote declares that “a young girl, vain of her beauty, and whose chief study and employment is the decoration of her person, is a most contemptible character.”¹⁴ According to Bonhote, this vanity and constant search for admiration would have perilous consequences for the entire family: “Few men would venture to marry a woman whose taste and inclination would lead her to spend double the income of her portion in the decoration of her person.”¹⁵ In order to guarantee the financial prosperity of the household, therefore, a woman would have to be able to keep her own desires and interests under control.

Conduct book literature also emphasises that idea that a female manager would have to be capable of not only successfully regulating the more practical aspects of household management, but also of establishing order and supervising others. This last aspect of her role was equally dependent on her capacity for self-management, as well as good conduct. This interdependence inevitably creates a link between the morality of the mistress and the state of the household under her management. According to Michael McKeon, “the public regulation of both morals and finances was internalised in the domestic and private role of wife and mother.”¹⁶ Thus, during the Georgian period, the responsibility of creating a domestic space of order and harmony became part of the role attributed to the female manager. As Margaret Ponsonby argues, “The house was increasingly expected to be a haven of domesticity: in particular it should be the woman’s role to create a home for her family.”¹⁷ This argument resulted in the condition of the morals of the family,

and the presence or absence of order within the household, becoming directly associated with the virtue of its female manager. As explained by Amanda Vickery, “A powerful correlation was already forged between household neatness and modesty in women . . . The wholesomeness of the interior was a demonstration of the virtues of the wife.”¹⁸

By the end of the eighteenth century, this correlation had become well-established. As Judith S. Lewis has demonstrated, the domestic space was conceived as female in correspondence of the period: “guests went to Lady Jersey’s or Lady Palmerston’s, even if their lordships were physically present. The Duchess of Devonshire even went so far as to record in her diary for 1788 that she ‘saw Sheridan at Mrs. Sheridan’s.’”¹⁹ Conduct books demonstrate the consequences of the establishment of this association by presenting good management as something that is essential for the maintenance of the morality and financial prosperity of the household, moral disintegration and ruin following when it is neglected. For example, some connect the unsatisfactory work of the servants and the subsequent lack of order in a household with the manager’s inability to provide them with an example of good conduct. As the author of *Domestic Management* affirms: “Good mistresses make good servants; and, on the contrary, bad mistresses will make bad servants.”²⁰ This idea is also expressed by More, who argues that “she who has the best regulated mind will have the best regulated family. As in the superintendence of the universe, wisdom is seen in its effects.”²¹ When looking for an explanation for disorder and moral disintegration in a household, More argues, one would only need to look at its mistress. In his own conduct book, *The Country Housewife’s Family Companion*, W. Ellis, a farmer, establishes the same parallel between effective household management and female self-management. Paraphrasing and supporting the ideas of another author who remains unnamed throughout the book, Ellis criticises what he sees as women’s lack of self-control over their consumerist desires: “the Dames of our Days, who . . . consume their Substance in foolish Expenses, rather than conserve it by wise Oeconomy.”²² According to him, this distracts female managers from their responsibility of educating their children and supervising those around them: “who have no concern on them of bringing up their Children in Piety, not to keep their Servants in their Duty; who take no Account of what passes in their Family.”²³ This criticism is subsequently followed by Ellis’s description of his model for female excellence:

This was not the Life of that generous Woman who was the Model of her Sex; that . . . knew all the Secrets of Oeconomy and Government; there was nothing better managed than her House, nor nothing better regulated than her Person; she had a very great Care in the Education of her Children, and of the Fidelity of her Servants . . . she had no Poor about her that escaped her Knowledge and her Charity.²⁴

Ellis's choice of words echoes that of More's, through which he also argues that the ability for self-management is a requirement for a capable mistress of a house. In addition, his statement emphasises the importance of other aspects of the role of female manager, particularly the duty of providing her children, her servants and the poorest of her community with a sound moral example.

The education of her children can be seen, in fact, as one of the most important aspects of the duty of managing the moral resources of the household that was attributed to the female manager. While several conduct books place great emphasis in this topic — such as Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* and More's *Strictures* — Richard and Maria Edgeworth's *A Practical Education* is particularly interesting, as it broaches this subject in its self-justification. This work begins with an introduction, written by Richard L. Edgeworth, in which he attributes the authorship of the greatest portion of the book to his daughter, Maria, explaining that she was inspired to write about education by the example of her mother. He also ascribes the ideas for one chapter to Maria's own mother, legitimising her authority in the subject by mentioning her success in the moral education of her children, which he terms "management": "She was encouraged and enabled to write upon this important subject, by having for many years before her eyes the conduct of a judicious mother in the education of a large family. The chapter on Obedience was written from the late Mrs Edgeworth's notes, and was exemplified by her successful practice in the management of her children."²⁵ Maria Edgeworth's mother is thus described as a good manager, who not only shared knowledge on household management with her daughter but also provided her with a sound moral example.

Other sections of *A Practical Education* place emphasis on the importance of the provision of this moral example and the ways in which it can impact the personal development of the children:

If children hear their parents express violent admiration for riches, rank, power, or fame, they catch a species of enthusiasm for these things, before they can estimate justly their value Children who live with persons of good sense learn to separate the ideas of happiness and a coach and six; but young people who see their fathers, mothers, and preceptors, all smitten with sudden admiration at the sight of a fine phaeton, or a fine gentleman, are immediately infected with the same absurd enthusiasm.²⁶

According to Edgeworth, the kind of person a child will become is dependent on the moral example with which it is provided. Thus, if a child is, even if inadvertently, raised in a household where extravagance is rife and material possessions and public acclaim are highly esteemed, the likelihood that in its adulthood it will value such things is great. This relates to the idea of self-management, in

the sense that it requires the female manager to self-manage her more frivolous or misguided desires in order to provide the children with a solid moral example. Nevertheless, interestingly, Edgeworth extends the responsibility to both parents, rather than just to the mother. Instead of attributing the entirety of the responsibility for the children's moral development to the female manager, therefore, Edgeworth recommends that it should be shared between both parents.

2. Surrogate Managers

In *Mansfield Park* and *Persuasion* Austen approaches the topic of female management through a common trope in the plot: in both novels, a female character attempts to appropriate the position of household manager from the legitimate manager, in spite of the fact that there is no possibility that they will ever own the property in question. Legitimacy is not portrayed as being related to legal ownership of property, since the legitimate managers lack this as much as the illegitimate ones. Instead, a manager is considered legitimate by the other characters if they possess a close familial tie to the legal owner. Consequently, the wife or the daughter of the owner is regarded as having a legitimate claim to the role of manager, whereas anyone with a less direct link is considered as lacking in it. In *Mansfield Park* this character is Mrs Norris and in *Persuasion* it is Mrs Clay. Both characters infiltrate themselves into the family through similar manoeuvres. Mrs Clay's justification for visiting Kellynch is her health: "nothing being of so much use to Mrs Clay's health as a drive to Kellynch."²⁷ Mrs Norris, on the other hand, claims to be anxious for Sir Thomas's safety: "she could not help feeling dreadful presentiments, and as the long evenings of autumn came on, was so terribly haunted by these ideas, in the sad solitariness of her cottage, as to be obliged to take daily refuge in the dining room of the park."²⁸ Fraught with irony, these excerpts present the two characters as cunning and self-serving, placing their motivations in direct opposition to the disinterestedness and self-restraint commended in conduct books.

Appropriating the position of manager, however, is not an easy task. The attempts of both Mrs Norris and Mrs Clay only become a possibility due to vulnerability at the heart of the household. Indeed, Austen's portrayal of the legitimate managers also appears to follow didactic lines, as their performance of the role is presented as being antithetical to the paragon of domestic management put forward by the conduct books. In *Mansfield Park*, Lady Bertram, who from the very first pages of the novel is described as wholly indolent, has entirely given up her role as the manager of the household. Extremely superficial, her domestic activities around Mansfield Park are characterised by a lack of usefulness, as her time is said to be spent "sitting nicely dressed on a sofa,

doing some long piece of needlework, of little use and no beauty.”²⁹ Her complete ignorance of her duties as manager is further expressed by her declaration, upon Sir Thomas’s return from Antigua, that “her own time had been irreproachably spent during his absence; she had done a great deal of carpet work and made many yards of fringe.”³⁰ Concerned solely with her physical appearance and refusing to do any useful work, this character thus represents the former aristocratic mode of female excellence criticised by authors such as Wollstonecraft and Mrs Bonhote. Focused only on being “seen,” Lady Bertram lacks the ability to supervise those around her and, consequently, of assuring the smooth running of her household.

Throughout the novel, this character is presented as failing in the management of both the financial and the moral resources of her household. Her sister, Mrs Norris, is aware of the possibility of the family facing financial problems in the future: “Why, you know Sir Thomas’s means will be rather strained, if the Antigua estate is to make such poor returns.”³¹ Contrastingly, Lady Bertram possesses such a limited knowledge of household management that she remains blissfully oblivious to any potential financial complications: “Oh! that will be soon settled. Sir Thomas has been writing about it, I know.”³² As indicated in Mrs Taylor’s conduct book, a woman’s unawareness of the family’s financial situation would prevent her from successfully managing her household. This ignorance in Lady Bertram also prevents her from establishing a companionate relationship with her husband based on mutual support. Due to his wife’s lack of knowledge of business, Sir Thomas is left to manage the financial affairs of his household without his wife’s advice or moral support.

Lady Bertram is also presented as an unsatisfactory educator and moral guide to her children, who does not dedicate any of her time to the supervision of their education and does not evidence any qualms in doing so: “To the education of her daughters, Lady Bertram paid not the smallest attention. She had no time for such cares.”³³ As Alistair Duckworth remarked in *The Improvement of the Estate*, this indifferent attitude demonstrates Lady Bertram’s “withdrawal from any sense of personal responsibility for the behaviour of her children — just as her exaggerated concern for her lap dog Pug testifies to the displacement of her ethical duty.”³⁴ Her characterisation thus matches Ellis’s depiction of an incapable manager, as she takes “no Account of what passes in [her] family.”³⁵ More specifically, Lady Bertram’s neglect of both the financial and the moral aspects of household management are evidence of her relinquishment of the role of manager, which was legitimately hers. Having given up her responsibilities, she leaves her household vulnerable to Mrs Norris’s ambitions and control.

The situation in Kellynch Hall at the beginning of *Persuasion* is similarly vulnerable, as the rightful manager has also given up her responsibilities. As the oldest daughter of a widowed father,

the role of manager legitimately belongs to Elizabeth. Despite the fact that her father, as the owner of the property, has the power to limit the extent of her influence in the management of the household, Austen offers no indication that he does so. *Persuasion* opens with a description of Elizabeth's failure in the performance of the role of manager. In its first few pages, we are informed that the Elliot family is in financial difficulty, something which had previously been prevented by the exemplary management of the late Lady Elliot. "While Lady Elliot lived, there had been method, moderation, and economy," Austen writes, thus characterising Lady Elliot as someone with knowledge of domestic economy.³⁶ Indeed, this description echoes that of the paragon of domestic management put forward by Mrs Taylor in her conduct book, who would undertake the establishment of "economy, order, and regularity" in the household.³⁷ The description of Elizabeth's management contrasts significantly with her mother's, as her "laying down of the domestic law at home" consists on the exhibition of external signs of rank and wealth: "For thirteen years she had been doing the honours . . . and leading the way out of the chaise and four . . . Thirteen winters' revolving frosts had seen her opening every ball of credit."³⁸ In spite of the fact that it is precisely this extravagance which places the family in financial strain, Elizabeth remains fully unaware of the situation, which reveals a lack of knowledge in economy. When she is informed by her father of the real state of their financial affairs she, like him, rejects any accountability for it: "she felt herself ill-used and unfortunate, as did her father."³⁹ Instead of presenting the establishment of these principles as the sole responsibility of Elizabeth and hence as something gendered, Austen describes not only her managerial failures but also her father's. The collapse of the family's finances is therefore presented as the consequence of the mismanagement of both the male and the female managers of the household.

The management of a household, at which both the legitimate managers of Kellynch and Mansfield Park fail, is a complex task that must combine not only regularity and the maintenance of order but also improvement. On one hand, the manager is expected to guarantee the financial stability of the household, as well as the maintenance of the standing in the community and the active participation in it. On the other, with every new manager innovation and improvement in the undertaking of their responsibilities are also expected. Whenever a household manager in Austen reveals an inability to deliver this innovation and is content with adopting the same forms of administration as their predecessor, this is presented as a sign of their unsatisfactory management. The managers of both Kellynch and Mansfield Park fail to do this, thus allowing for the infiltration of the prospective surrogate managers into the household.

The position of manager in Mansfield Park consequently becomes available and is taken up by Lady Bertram's sister Mrs Norris. At the opening of the novel, Austen explains the reasons

behind the discrepancy in the situations of the two sisters through the use of irony. Despite having been in her youth “quite as handsome as her sister,” Mrs Norris fails to make as good a match because “there certainly are not so many men of large fortune in the world, as there are pretty women to deserve them.”⁴⁰ Consequently, Mrs Norris is “obliged to be attached to the Rev. Mr. Norris, a friend of her brother-in-law, with scarcely any private fortune.”⁴¹ Austen’s irony in both instances conveys the lack of opportunities available to genteel women for securing a comfortable financial situation for themselves, thereby presenting Mrs Norris’s decision as justified. Subsequent descriptions of Mrs Norris during her marriage and then widowhood, however, place emphasis on her morally reprehensible behaviour. Indeed, Austen indicates that, having married into a lower income and standing in society than she hoped for, her frustration with the disappointment of her expectations and jealousy of her sister’s superior position in society make her miserly and rapacious. According to Maggie Lane, as the widow of a clergyman, Mrs Norris would find herself “without a public role or social standing,” something which she refuses to accept.⁴² She therefore takes on the role of Maria and Julia’s surrogate mother, accompanying her nieces to the social events from which Lady Bertram takes no pleasure: “Lady Bertram did not go into public with her daughters. She was too indolent even to accept a mother’s gratification in witnessing their success . . . the charge was made over to her sister, who desired nothing better than a post of such honourable representation.”⁴³ Lady Bertram thus gives up her social and moral responsibilities to Mrs Norris, who is thereby granted a higher social status than the one she would have as a clergyman’s widow. She is also allowed to mix with people of higher social positions and to collect all the rewards that come with it. Intent on having her nieces marry well, the result of which would be considerably more privileges for herself, Mrs Norris also takes up her time “promoting gaieties for her nieces, and looking around for their future husbands.”⁴⁴ Described as having “no real affection for her sister,” Mrs Norris’s interest in the concerns of her nieces can also be seen as stemming not from real love for them, but from the hope that she will have something to gain from their advantageous marriages.⁴⁵ As such, she is presented as lacking the ability to put her personal desires aside in order to successfully supervise the young people in the household.

While in *Mansfield Park* it is clearly her sister’s role Mrs Norris is trying to take for herself, the question of whose role Mrs Clay wishes to appropriate in *Persuasion* is more complex. Lady Russell’s first expression of distaste for Mrs Clay, for instance, stems from her belief that she is attempting to steal the role of secondary manager from Anne: “Mrs Clay engaged to go . . . as a most important and valuable assistant to the latter [Elizabeth] in all the business before her.”⁴⁶ To Lady Russell, this constitutes a usurpation of a role that is not legitimately hers and an “affront . . . to Anne.”⁴⁷ Lady Russell also sees the prospective marriage between Sir Walter Elliot and Mrs Clay as the

appropriation of a role that she believes to be rightfully Anne's, as she wishes to see her as the future mistress of Kellynch. Anne, on the other hand, is baffled by Elizabeth's acceptance of Mrs Clay into their household since, in the case of a marriage between Mrs Clay and Sir Walter, Elizabeth would lose her role as manager and be "in the event of such a reverse . . . so much more to be pitied than herself."⁴⁸ This also constitutes another indication that other characters consider Elizabeth's involvement in the management of the household to be considerable.

A common aspect between Mrs Clay and Mrs Norris is that the language associated with both characters is connected to the idea of threat, danger and invasion. This is despite the fact that whereas Mrs Norris actively attempts to manage Mansfield Park, Mrs Clay never has the opportunity to do the same with Sir Walter's household, and only presents the possibility that she might manage it in the future. In *Persuasion*, this sort of language is linked to Mrs Clay, particularly whenever the thoughts of Lady Russell, Anne and Mr Elliot about her are expressed through free indirect speech. Anne first describes the intimacy between Mrs Clay and her father and sister as something which could bring "results the most serious" to the family.⁴⁹ Anne is also suspicious of her "acute mind and assiduous pleasing manners" which she considers to be such "dangerous attractions" that leave her "so impressed by the degree of their danger."⁵⁰ Lady Russell's thoughts also express this sense of threat, as she regards the increasing closeness between Mrs Clay and the Elliot family as an infestation, describing it as "the plague of Mrs Clay."⁵¹ The sense of threat is again adopted in Mrs Smith's description of Mr Elliot's resolution to re-establish a relationship with Sir Walter, in order to attempt to prevent a marriage between him and Mrs Clay: "the resolution of coming to Bath as soon as possible . . . with the view of . . . recovering such a footing in the family, as might give him the means of ascertaining the degree of his danger, and of circumventing the lady if he found it material."⁵² This strong language, depicting Mrs Clay as a menace that must be subjugated is mirrored by Anne's thoughts who, "pleased with him [Mr Elliot] for not liking Mrs Clay," begins to regard him as an ally in the goal of "defeating her [Mrs Clay]."⁵³

The presence of such a negative language associated with Mrs Clay illustrates the illegitimate nature that these three characters attribute to her ambitions of marrying Sir Walter and becoming mistress of Kellynch. Lady Russell's distaste for Mrs Clay originates in her belief that Anne is the legitimate successor of her old friend, Lady Elliot, as mistress of Kellynch. In spite of the fact that Anne reacts with the same suspicion towards Mrs Clay because she sees her as attempting to steal Elizabeth's role in the household, the truth is that she is just as reluctant as Lady Russell to accept her as her mother's successor. Furthermore, Anne's attachment towards Kellynch also makes the idea of one day becoming its mistress attractive to her, which constitutes a further reason for her contempt towards Mrs Clay. Mr Elliot, on the other hand, feels threatened by Mrs Clay, since her

marriage with Sir Walter could potentially result in a male heir, which would prevent him from inheriting Kellynch and receiving the title that comes with its ownership.

Language connecting a prospective surrogate manager to a sense of threat and danger is also present in *Mansfield Park*. Towards the end of the novel, Fanny reflects on Mrs Norris's share in the moral disintegration of the family at Mansfield Park, using the word "evil" to characterise her: "the still greater evil of a restless, officious companion, too apt to be heightening danger in order to enhance her own importance."⁵⁴ The same applies to Sir Thomas who, upon Mrs Norris's decision to leave Mansfield Park, considers her former presence in his household as an "evil."⁵⁵ Whereas Fanny is incapable of feeling affection towards Mrs Norris due to the neglectful and even cruel way in which she treats her, Sir Thomas is also biased towards her, since he considers her to be, to a certain extent, responsible for the moral faux pas committed by his daughters. Just like in *Persuasion*, the language related to a sense of threat is adopted by characters who are prejudiced, for whatever reason, towards the surrogate managers.

While these negative feelings of other characters towards Mrs Norris and Mrs Clay are comparable, the sympathy from the narrator is arguably dissimilar. Indeed, while the narrative does emphasise Mrs Clay's cunning and self-serving nature, the narrator presents the motivation behind her wish to marry Sir Walter as understandable. A widow with two children, who has found herself living once again in a state of dependence in her father's house, Mrs Clay's situation is pitiable. Her discontentment with her dependent state, therefore, makes her egotistical motives seem more excusable. Austen also suggests a complexity to Mrs Clay that characters biased towards her seem unaware of, as we see in this excerpt:

Anne admired the good acting of the friend [Mrs Clay], in being able to show such pleasure as she did, in the expectation, and in the actual arrival of the very person whose presence must really be interfering with her prime object. It was impossible but that Mrs Clay must hate the sight of Mr Elliot; and yet she could assume a most obliging, placid look, and appear quite satisfied with the curtailed license of devoting herself only half as much to Sir Walter as she would have done otherwise.⁵⁶

What Anne is unaware of at this point in the narrative is that Mrs Clay is genuinely happy at the prospect of meeting Mr Elliot. The irony is in Anne's belief that Mrs Clay is more sly than she really is and her consequent assumption that her behaviour is "acting." In this instance, Mrs Clay is not being calculating and reserved, but acting out of a genuine affection for Mr Elliot, which causes her to abandon her previous plan of marrying Sir Walter. Therefore, it is not the narrator's

characterisation that presents Mrs Clay as a calculating person at this point in the narrative, but Anne's biased and misinformed opinion of her.

Mrs Norris, on the other hand, can be said to receive comparatively less sympathy from the narrator. Whereas Mrs Clay's situation in society is patently precarious, with £600 pounds a month and no one to support, Mrs Norris could lead a comfortable, independent life, without placing herself in a situation of dependence towards her sister and brother-in-law, if only she were not so unwilling to accept her comparatively lower status in society. It is precisely this refusal that leads her to attempt to seize her sister's role as manager of Mansfield Park. Frustrated with her lower status, Fanny becomes the target, John Wiltshire affirms, of the "worthlessness, inferiority and indebtedness [Mrs Norris] . . . is so anxious to deny in herself."⁵⁷ Fanny is therefore "humiliated and punished . . . scolded and victimised . . . so that Mrs Norris can momentarily appease her own sense of functionless dependence, and reaffirm the strictness of the social hierarchy which gives meaning to her life."⁵⁸ The role of nurse to the servants that Mrs Norris adopts is, equally, "a traditional role for the genteel but otherwise disempowered woman."⁵⁹ Through this "benevolence intricate with (and sometimes masking) coercion," Mrs Norris "punishes others for her own dependency and frustration, whilst being able to hide this from herself in the guise of generosity to the recipients and loyal service to the system."⁶⁰ By adopting this role, therefore, Mrs Norris desperately attempts to hang on to a stratified system of hierarchy in which her position is still comparatively higher. Nevertheless, it is worth remembering that, by indicating in the first page of the novel that Mrs Norris "found herself obliged to be attached to the Rev. Mr. Norris" for lack of a wealthier suitor, Austen indicates that the influence and financial comfort she is seeking is not something that would be accessible to her in any other way.⁶¹

Throughout the novel, Mrs Norris is portrayed attempting to present herself as someone whose contributions to the household are representative of a "thrifty, skilful mode of domestic management," and in direct opposition to her sister's inertia.⁶² Despite this, she is portrayed as constantly expecting to be complimented for useless managerial work and even work she does not actually do. For instance, one of the things Mrs Norris boasts about the most is her resourcefulness and the benefits it brings to Mansfield Park: "I am of some use I hope in preventing waste and making the most of things."⁶³ She also permanently calls attention to her supposed self-sacrifices: "much exertion and many sacrifices to glance at in the form of hurried walks and sudden removals from her own fireside, and many excellent hints of distrust and economy to Lady Bertram and Edmund to detail, whereby a most considerable saving had always arisen."⁶⁴ However, even if anything is saved, such as the green baize for the curtain in the theatricals, Mrs Norris keeps it for herself. Even in her own house, money is saved to no benefit. In spite of her boast that she and her

late husband did “a vast deal” of improvements at the personage, the only one she mentions is the plantation of one apricot tree, which was originally a present from Sir Thomas.⁶⁵ This aspect is particularly significant since, in spite of her substantial savings, Mrs Norris does not invest her money into the improvement of her household or introduce any innovations in its management. Through her management, her household remains financially sustainable but ultimately static. Furthermore, the only example of the “excellent hints of distrust and economy” she presents is her confrontation with the son of a servant because he attempted to take a few pieces of wood for his personal use. Her unkindness thus contrasts with the paragon of the female manager put forward by Ellis, who nurtures “the fidelity of her servants.”⁶⁶ In reality, no excerpt in the novel presents her offering any form of useful advice about saving money, and her antagonistic behaviour towards the servants ultimately brings no benefit to Mansfield Park.

The episode of the theatricals is also illustrative of Austen’s portrayal of Mrs Norris’s claims to satisfactory household management as unfounded. Indeed, despite offering her help with the organisation so as to be able to supervise her nieces and nephews, (“There should always be one steady head to superintend so many young ones”) she instead supports all of their plans for extravagant expenses.⁶⁷ As a moral guide Mrs Norris is equally unavailing, since she never sees anything objectionable in the behaviour of the young people, from the invitation of a stranger into the house, Mr Yates, or the flirtatious behaviour between her niece Maria and Henry Crawford. It soon becomes clear that her motivations behind offering her assistance are not the wish to be useful and contribute towards the welfare of the family, but the egotistical self-gratification from the “hurry, bustle and importance.”⁶⁸ This egotism is illustrative of the lack of a detached perspective, essential to a successful household management, that both the surrogate managers lack. Too engrossed by her obsession with hoarding money and her ambitions for a higher position in the family and in society in general, Mrs Norris naturally lacks the ability for self-management that characterise a good household manager. Unable to control her own desires and see beyond herself, Mrs Norris unsurprisingly reveals herself incapable of supervising those around her. Unlike Fanny who, as argued by Wendy Lee, possesses the ability for self-management that allows her to “see . . . the situation quite clearly because she can look beyond her own emotional needs,” Mrs Norris is blind to the eminent consequences of the behaviour of her nieces.⁶⁹ This egotism and inability to control one’s desires also characterise Mrs Clay, who only attempts to become the new mistress of Kellynch to satisfy her own interests.

Whereas in *Persuasion* the reader is only informed of Mrs Clay’s increasingly closer intimacy with the Elliots, in *Mansfield Park* Mrs Norris’s attempts at becoming the new manager of her sister’s household are described in detail, as well as her ultimate failure to achieve this. In fact, from the

moment of Sir Thomas's return it becomes progressively more obvious that Mrs Norris does not do any useful managerial work in Mansfield Park:

she was vexed by the manner of his return. It had left her nothing to do . . . Sir Thomas . . . had sought no confidant but the butler, and had been following him almost instantaneously into the drawing-room. Mrs Norris felt herself defrauded of an office in which she had always depended, whether his arrival or his death were to be the thing unfolded; and was now trying to be in a bustle without having anything to bustle about, and labouring to be important where nothing was wanted but tranquility and silence.⁷⁰

The intimation that Mrs Norris "had always depended" on a role that is plainly unnecessary shows her at her most vulnerable. Sir Thomas seeking "no confidant but the butler" indicates that he has employed all the help he requires and that Mrs Norris's role in Mansfield Park is, in fact, non-existent. The use of the word "bustle" also suggests that the activities in which she engages are void of purpose.

Mrs Norris's failure to establish herself as the manager of Mansfield Park and her increasing powerlessness also demonstrates the precarious nature of this role and form of relationship towards property. Indeed, in attempting to supervise a house whose owner is only her brother-in-law rather than husband, Mrs Norris places herself in a situation in which the family can dismiss her if she is deemed unnecessary. Maria's scandalous elopement is Mrs Norris's final disappointment in her attempt to appropriate the role of manager, as one of her prized achievements was the matchmaking of Maria and Mr Rushworth. After she is informed of the elopement, she is completely defeated: "She was an altered creature, quieted, stupefied, indifferent to every thing that passed."⁷¹ Johnson argues that at this point in the novel Mrs Norris is sent away from Mansfield Park as a way of preventing Sir Thomas from coming to terms with his share of accountability for the moral disintegration of his family: "[Mrs Norris's] banishment relieves [Sir Thomas] . . . from the necessity of examining the mutuality of his responsibility in the ruin of his family. The restoration to Sir Thomas of some semblance of moral dignity depends on Mrs Norris's eruption into mythical loathsomeness."⁷² However, concurrently, Sir Thomas does come to terms with his mistakes in the management of his daughters' education, such as his attempt to oppose with severity "the excessive indulgence and flattery" of Mrs Norris and his failure to teach his daughters a "sense of duty" and good moral principles: "of the necessity of self-denial and humility, he feared they had never heard from any lips that could profit them."⁷³

It is also worth emphasising that, in contrast to Nora Nachumi's declaration that these "bad" characters are expelled from Mansfield Park by the end of the novel," in reality, Mrs Norris is never actually asked to leave Mansfield Park.⁷⁴ Her fate at the end of the novel is also more complex than Wendy Anne Lee's suggestion that it is representative of the idea that "sometimes hostile people cannot be integrated into better society, cannot remain in the family circle."⁷⁵ As Lee herself declares, a "more deeply unified household of Sir Thomas Bertram would not have been vulnerable to the influence of Aunt Norris" and, by the end of *Mansfield Park*, "the conditions that have led to disaster remain firmly in place."⁷⁶ Indeed, it was precisely Sir Thomas's and Lady Bertram's neglect in the management of their children that allowed Mrs Norris to step in and attempt to supervise the behaviour of her nieces in the first place. By attributing culpability for the moral degradation of the family to Sir Thomas as well as Lady Bertram, Austen aligns herself with the sentiment that the responsibility for the moral development of the children should be shared by both parents, as argued by Edgeworth and her father. This is not acknowledged, however, by either Fanny or Sir Thomas. Naturally biased against Mrs Norris, Sir Thomas because he does not approve of her attempt to appropriate his wife's role, and Fanny due to her cruelty towards her, both characters consider Mrs Norris as a threat and blame her for the moral degradation of the family. Curiously, none of these characters attribute any blame to Lady Bertram, the legitimate manager of Mansfield Park. Having relinquished the position of manager and the moral duties of supervisor of her children's education so completely, Lady Bertram is not presented by any of the characters as sharing any responsibility for the adverse events. Unlike her sister, Lady Bertram never claimed responsibility for the supervision of her daughters and so, at the end of the novel, it is Mrs Norris who is blamed for failing in her role as a moral guide.

Ultimately, Mrs Norris's departure from Mansfield Park represents not her punishment but a possible reform on her part. In fact, Austen indicates that she makes a conscious decision to leave Mansfield Park and, consequently, to abandon all her ambitions for a higher position in society and increased prosperity: "It ended in Mrs. Norris's resolving to quit Mansfield."⁷⁷ In doing so, Mrs Norris finally appears to embody the values of usefulness and disinterestedness comprised in the notion of oeconomy. Leaving behind the comforts of Mansfield Park, Mrs Norris decides to "devote herself to her unfortunate Maria" in a "remote and private" place, where she and her niece will be "shut up together with little society."⁷⁸ The fact that Mrs Norris voluntarily chooses a situation characterised by the same isolation she had been trying to escape, in order to support her niece at a trying time, is revealing of an ability to be selfless and disinterested that she did not appear to possess before.

Both the legitimate managers in the two novels and Mrs Norris are portrayed by Austen as failing in this role because they lack the qualities that conduct book literature presented as essential to its suitable performance. Mrs Clay, while not shown engaging in actual financial management, is presented as also lacking the potential to succeed in this role. In doing so, Austen establishes clear moral distinctions between characters in a way that is arguably didactic. In spite of this, the description of Mrs Norris's destiny, as well as that of Mrs Clay, is characterised by ambiguity rather than straightforward didacticism. There is no simple resolution at the end of *Mansfield Park* in which Mrs Norris, the "bad" character is punished and expelled from the family forever. Instead, there is an indication that she is a more complex character, with the ability for improvement and reform. Similarly, in *Persuasion*, Mrs Clay's complexity as a character is revealed when ultimately her plans fail because her affection for Mr Elliot overpowers her ambition. After her father rebukes her for choosing to visit someone with such a low position in society as Mrs Smith instead of their cousins, the Dalrymples, Anne, thinking of Mrs Clay, hopes that he will "recollect, that Mrs Smith was not the only widow in Bath between thirty and forty, with little to live on, and no surname of dignity."⁷⁹ It is worth noting that, by the end of *Persuasion*, Mrs Smith achieves her happy ending: with the assistance of Wentworth, she acquires a prosperous income from her husband's property in the West Indies. This is not presented as a reward for her morally irreprehensible behaviour: in the defence of her own interests, Mrs Smith almost risks Anne's happiness by advising her to marry Mr Elliot and, at the end, acquires property that is none other than slave plantations. Arguably, Mrs Smith is capable of even more morally condemnable actions to achieve financial stability than Mrs Clay is. For this reason, it is interesting that Anne should be so sympathetic towards Mrs Smith and so wholly unsympathetic towards Mrs Clay.

An explanation for this would be, as has been argued earlier, that Anne is opposed to Mrs Clay because she regards her as someone who is attempting to appropriate a role that belongs to her sister, that Anne desires for herself, and that once belonged — and was exemplarily performed — by her mother. The ending of *Persuasion*, however, indicates that, unlike Anne, the narrator feels some sympathy towards Mrs Clay. Indeed, the final piece of information Austen provides about Mrs Clay is the following:

Mrs. Clay's affections had overpowered her interest, and she had sacrificed, for the young man's sake, the possibility of scheming longer for Sir Walter. She has abilities, however, as well as affections; and it is now a doubtful point whether his cunning, or hers, may finally carry the day; whether after preventing her from being the wife of Sir Walter, he may not be wheedled and caressed at last into making her the wife of Sir William.⁸⁰

In this excerpt, Mrs Clay is portrayed as someone who, in spite of her genuine “affections,” has not lost her calculating nature (“abilities”), and who is willing to resort to seduction and psychological manipulation (“wheedled and caressed”), to achieve her goals. The novel thus ends with a clear indication that Mrs Clay may still one day return to Kellynch as its mistress. Instead of punishing Mrs Clay for her schemes, the possibility that Mrs Clay’s cunning “may finally carry the day” against that of such a negative character as Mr Elliot is, if anything, a pleasing possibility. *Mansfield Park* and *Persuasion* thus end not with a didactic lesson on the characteristics to be desired on a female household manager or with the clear expulsion and punishment of the two characters that have failed as surrogate managers, but with ambiguity.

While property and the way it is administered is always central to Austen’s work, her exploration of the possibilities and limitations of the role of surrogate manager reflects her interest in the position of women within a system that restricts their opportunities for property ownership. Through the portrayal of Mrs Clay and Mrs Norris, Austen engages with the on-going dialogue on female management and the expectations placed on it by society in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Indeed, both characters are presented as coveting the power and status that comes from the role of manager for selfish reasons, whilst revealing themselves to be reluctant to shoulder its responsibilities. On one hand, this attitude is antithetical to the values expressed in conduct books, according to which a female manager should regulate her own desire in the execution of her role. More importantly, however, it represents the refusal of the power and responsibility offered to women in this role, which enables them to guarantee the maintenance of the morality, as well as the financial prosperity, of the household. It is not only the surrogate managers who are guilty of this, but also the legitimate managers they attempt to replace. By missing this opportunity, these characters establish a sense of ownership towards the property that ultimately does not result in any improvements. On the contrary, their management — or, in Mrs Clay’s case, the possibility of her management — either proves to be nefarious for the household by threatening its stability or results in it remaining stationary. In spite of this, Austen’s refusal of didacticism means that Mrs Norris and Mrs Clay are not used to express a moral lesson by the end of the novels. Instead, these characters and their attempts at appropriating the role of household manager illustrate the extent to which someone may be willing to go in order to have one’s feelings of ownership towards property legitimised. Mrs Norris’s and Mrs Clay’s position as disempowered women limits them in such a way that usurping the roles of the legitimate managers is the only alternative they can find for the secluded lives they have been forced to lead. The surrogate managers’ willingness to engage in morally reprehensible behaviour can therefore be seen as

symptomatic of their awareness of their limited options. Consequently, their actions are not presented as being completely unwarranted, particularly in the case of Mrs Clay, whose situation is comparatively more precarious. The endings also indicate that the characters, although flawed, are not as morally corrupt as the other characters seem to believe them to be. Indeed, , easy as it would have been to write thoroughly didactic endings in which the two characters are expelled “into mythical loathsomeness,” Austen makes a conscious decision not to punish either character for their moral failures.⁸¹ Instead of this, the reader is acquainted with their motivations to the point that it is possible to understand them, if not, in the case of Mrs Norris, to fully sympathise with them. Moreover, not only are these characters not exclusively attributed responsibility for the moral disintegration in the family, but the vulnerability at the heart of the household that allowed them to intrude is still in place at the end of both novels. Austen’s achievement is thus to illustrate not just the possibilities that the managerial role possesses for women and the positive contributions they can make through it, but also the limitations of a system that restricts them to the extent that the opportunity to become a household manager, even a surrogate one, becomes so enticing.

¹ Marilyn Butler, *Romantics, Rebels and Reactionaries: English Literature and Its Background, 1760-1830* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), p. 102.

² Claudia Johnson, *Jane Austen: Women, Politics and the Novel* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1988), p. 12.

³ Nora Nachumi, “Seeing Double: Theatrical Spectatorship in Mansfield Park,” *Philological Quarterly* 80.3 (2001), p. 238.

⁴ Nachumi, “Seeing Double,” p. 238.

⁵ Gillian Skinner, *Sensibility and Economics in the Novel, 1740-1800* (London: Macmillan, 1999), p. 6.

⁶ Anon. *Domestic Management and the Art of Conducting a Family* (London: H. D. Symonds, 1800), p. 4-5.

⁷ Mrs Taylor, *Practical Hints to Young Females, on the Duties of a Wife, a Mother, and a Mistress of a Family* (London: Taylor & Hessey, 1815), p. 17-18.

⁸ Nancy Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 59.

⁹ Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction*, p. 73-75.

¹⁰ Dror Wahrman, *Imaging the Middle class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, c. 1780-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 53, 147.

¹¹ Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction*, p. 75.

¹² Talia Schaffer, *Novel Craft: Victorian Domestic Handicraft and Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 33

-
- ¹³ Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (London: Penguin, 2004), p. 147.
- ¹⁴ Mrs Bonhote, *The Parental Monitor* (London: William Lane, 1796), p. 125.
- ¹⁵ Bonhote, *The Parental Monitor*, p. 104.
- ¹⁶ Michael McKeon, *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), p. 181.
- ¹⁷ Margaret Ponsonby, *Stories from Home: English Domestic Interiors, 1750-1850* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), p. 13.
- ¹⁸ Amanda Vickery, *Behind Closed Doors*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), p. 296.
- ¹⁹ Judith S. Lewis, *Sacred to Female Patriotism: Gender, Class and Politics in Late Georgian Britain* (London: Routledge, 2003), p. 100.
- ²⁰ Anon., *Domestic Management*, p. 8.
- ²¹ Hannah More, *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education* (London: T. Cadell, 1799), vol II of II, p. 3-4.
- ²² W. Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion* (London: James Hodges, 1750), p. viii.
- ²³ Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, p. viii.
- ²⁴ Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, p. viii-ix.
- ²⁵ Maria Edgeworth and Richard Lovell Edgeworth, *A Practical Education* (London: R. Hunter, 1815), vol I of II, p. x.
- ²⁶ Maria Edgeworth and Richard Lovell Edgeworth, *A Practical Education*, vol I of II, p. 308.
- ²⁷ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 21.
- ²⁸ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 30.
- ²⁹ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 16.
- ³⁰ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 140.
- ³¹ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 24.
- ³² Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 24.
- ³³ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 24.
- ³⁴ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 60.
- ³⁵ Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, p. viii.
- ³⁶ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 14.

³⁷ Mrs Taylor, *Practical Hints to Young Females, on the Duties of a Wife, a Mother, and a Mistress of a Family* (London: Taylor & Hessey, 1815), p. 17-18.

³⁸ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 12.

³⁹ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 14

⁴⁰ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 3.

⁴¹ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 3.

⁴² Maggie Lane, *Growing Older with Jane Austen* (London: Robert Hale, 2014), p. 78-79.

⁴³ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 27.

⁴⁴ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 27.

⁴⁵ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 7.

⁴⁶ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 32.

⁴⁷ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 32.

⁴⁸ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 33.

⁴⁹ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 33.

⁵⁰ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 33.

⁵¹ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 119.

⁵² Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 166.

⁵³ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 123.

⁵⁴ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 339.

⁵⁵ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 365.

⁵⁶ Austen, *Persuasion*, p.172.

⁵⁷ John Wiltshire, *Jane Austen and the Body: "The Picture of Health"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 92

⁵⁸ Wiltshire, *Jane Austen and the Body*, p. 92.

⁵⁹ Wiltshire, *Jane Austen and the Body*, p. 91.

⁶⁰ Wiltshire, *Jane Austen and the Body*, p. 91.

⁶¹ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 3.

⁶² Schaffer, *Novel Craft*, p. 33.

⁶³ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 112.

⁶⁴ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 147.

⁶⁵ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 42.

⁶⁶ Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, p. viii.

⁶⁷ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 112.

⁶⁸ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 102.

⁶⁹ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 241.

⁷⁰ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 141.

⁷¹ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 351.

⁷² Johnson, *Jane Austen*, p. 115.

⁷³ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 363, p. 364.

⁷⁴ Nora Nachumi, "Seeing Double: Theatrical Spectatorship in *Mansfield Park*," *Philological Quarterly* (2001), 80.3, p. 247.

⁷⁵ Wendy Anne Lee, "Resituating 'Regulated Hatred': D. W. Harding's *Jane Austen*," *ELH* (2010), 77.4, p. 1008.

⁷⁶ Lee, "Resituating 'Regulated Hatred,'" p. 1008. Nachumi, "Seeing Double," p. 247.

⁷⁷ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 365.

⁷⁸ Austen, *Mansfield Park*, p. 365.

⁷⁹ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 128.

⁸⁰ Austen, *Persuasion*, p. 201.

⁸¹ Johnson, *Jane Austen*, p. 115.